

REMARKS:

Claims 1 and 3 are in the case and presented for consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found throughout the originally filed specification, claims and drawings.

Claim 2 has been canceled and its subject matter has been incorporated into currently amended claim 1.

Applicant would like to respectfully make Examiner aware that the presently claimed invention was approved by the Patent Office of the Republic of Korea on April 11, 2005.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication WO 01/54346 A1 to Miettinen et al. ("Miettinen") in view of U.S. Patent 6,996,543 to Coppersmith et al. ("Coppersmith"). Additionally, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miettinen in view of Coppersmith and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0257055 filed by Anderson ("Anderson").

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections that the claims of the subject application are obvious in view of the cited prior art.

The cited references (Miettinen, Coppersmith and Anderson) are different from the presently claimed invention in not only their objective, but also in their technical

composition and effects.

Currently amended claim 1, comprises the steps of: setting and indicating the big-name brand's identification code along with a secret code for creating an electronic certificate(1) by using audio visual tag or RFID tag for corresponding big-name brand goods of the big-name brand before the first distribution or first purchase; requesting creation and transmission of an electronic certificate(1) for the goods by inputting the set identification code and secret code into an electronic-certificate creation server(10) by means of the audio visual tag or RFID tag at the first distribution or the first purchase, said electronic certificate(1) comprising the identification code, secret code, character image, and management program, and being constructed so that *only one electronic certificate can be created per goods when being created and said one electronic certificate can only move after being created.* (emphasis added).

Currently amended claim 1 also includes firstly creating the electronic certificate(1) for the goods at the electronic-certificate creation server(10) after confirming the identification code, when the request for genuine quality certification is received; transmitting the firstly created electronic certificate(1) to a client(50) of the first distributor or first purchaser through a wire/wireless network(40); and displaying the character image of the transmitted electronic certificate(1) on a display apparatus of the client(50) so that possession of the big-name brand or genuine quality can be shown, and authenticating the big-name brand or genuine quality can be achieved even without the step of authenticating the goods.

In other words, the technical main point of the present invention is a method for servicing an electronic certificate for a big-name brand or genuine quality that comprises

the identification code, secret code, character image, and management program of the big-name brand, that when created by the management program applies to only one big-name brand at a time, and said one electronic certificate can only move after being created, by displaying the character image of an electronic certificate(1) on a display apparatus of the client(50) such as computer, cell phone, etc. so that anyone who sees the character image of the electronic certificate(1) displayed to that client(50), knows the owner of the client(50) is the owner of the big-name brand, and can acknowledge the authenticity without verifying the goods.

However, the object of Miettinen is different from that of the present invention. Thus, it logically follows that Miettinen does not provide a method for servicing an electronic certificate for a big-name brand or genuine quality, in which the electronic certificate of the big-name brand or genuine quality itself can directly show ownership of the goods of the big-name brand or genuine quality by displaying an electronic certificate on the client system such as a mobile phone, in which authentication of the big-name brand or genuine quality can be achieved by authentication of the electronic certificate, and in which the electronic certificate can be transferred to another client of a new owner together with transfer of the goods of the big-name brand or genuine quality.

Additionally, Miettinen fails to disclose element claimed in currently amended independent claim 1 from which claim 3 depends.

Miettinen fails to disclose a electronic certificate which is “constructed so that only one electronic certificate can be created per goods.”

By contrast, Miettinen discloses “a first electronic identity for said entity. The *first*

identity is used as a "base" identity while issuing further identities. The method of issuing further comprises the following steps of creating a request for *a second electronic identity*" (emphasis added).

In addition, Miettinen does not disclose either "a character image" or "a management program" as claimed in currently amended claim 1.

The management program of the present invention "is desirably constructed so as for the electronic certificate(I) to be only able to move after its creation, that is, so as for the electronic certificate(I) to be cancelled when transmitted or copied, and so as to be capable of requesting confirmation of the goods of the big-name brand or genuine quality or change of rights, applying for a change of the secret code, inputting a new secret code, and so forth." [0016].

By contrast, no where in Miettinen (including in Figures 2 and 3) is there disclosed a management program which functions like that of currently amended independent claim 1.

The aforementioned elements of currently amended claim 1 are also missing from Coppersmith. For instance, the management program related to the flow chart illustrated in Figure 4 of Coppersmith does not contain all the above mentioned qualities as does the management program of the present invention.

Additionally, neither Miettinen nor Coppersmith provide a teaching or suggestion which could be used by one of ordinary skill in the art to come up with the above mentioned missing elements and hence to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

Furthermore, the claimed elements which are missing from Miettinen and Coppersmith are also absent from Anderson.

Moreover, Examiner pointed out that paragraph [0021]-[0023] and Figure 4 of Anderson clearly states the ability to regenerate ownership from the internal sources at any time and transmit through the network to devices for authentication.

However, this is distinctly different from the present invention's "stage achieving ownership transfer by moving the electronic big-name brand certificate along with the goods to the client after the move and deleting from the client before the move" which functions to prevent theft.

Anderson also does not contain any teaching or suggestion which could be used by one of ordinary skill in the art to think up and combine the otherwise missing elements and arrive at the presently claimed invention.

Therefore, because Miettinen, Coppersmith and Anderson all fail to disclose or suggest critical elements claimed in currently amended independent claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, and because they also fail to provide a teaching which could be used by one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the presently claimed invention, the combination of Miettinen, Coppersmith and Anderson does not render any of present claims 1 and 3 obvious.

Further, with respect to claim 3, Examiner pointed out that in cited reference Miettinen, at the time of creation and transmission of electronic certificate in the server that creates electronic certificate, a database is created of the electronic certificate.

However, when verification or certification is requested from the client Miettinen and

Coppersmith offer no suggestion or proposal whatsoever equivalent to the stage where the electronic big-name brand authentication/management server transmits big-name brand information and/or authentication results, or the stage achieving ownership transfer by moving the electronic big-name brand certificate along with the goods to the client after the move and deleting from the client before the move, as claimed in present claim 3.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, to advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
/SALVATORE P SPEZIO/
Salvatore P. Spezio
Reg. No. 60,868
Attorney for Applicant
(845) 359-7700

Dated: April 13, 2009

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706

R:\PATAMD\J323-053\J323-053-Amend-Draft1.wpd